

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are pending.

Claims 1-28 stand rejected.

Claims 1, 8, 15, and 22 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein.

Claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-21, and 23-28 have been amended.

Claims 29-39 have been added.

Claims 1, 8, 15, and 22 have been canceled and claims 29-39 have been added not for reasons of patentability but rather to focus on a different aspect of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-7 and 22-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as having no connection to the technological arts (i.e., computer, network, data processing, internet, etc.).

Claims 1 and 22 have been deleted. Claims 2-6 now depend (directly or indirectly) from new claim 29, and claims 23-28 now depend (directly or indirectly) from new claim 35.

Claim 29 recites in the claim body elements of the technical arts such as a first computer system and a second computer system. Claim 35 recites a computer system that comprises a series of elements that form at least a part of the computer system.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Meredith Little, "Buying and Selling a Car Online" (hereinafter "*Little*"). In view of the amendments and remarks contained in this response, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Little describes “how to use the Internet to research buying and selling a car”. *Little* p. 1. In particular *Little* describes shopping online for a car and locating a particular car on an Internet web site. *Little* also teaches that a user can access various pieces of information about a car, such as dealer invoice price, market price, and trade-in pricing.

The present invention goes beyond the teachings of *Little*. Embodiments of the present invention allow a user to configure a first product and allow a computer system to automatically generate a second configured product comparable to the first product. More specifically, claim 29 recites:

A method of comparing products wherein at least one of the products is automatically generated, the method comprising:
receiving data from a first computer system, wherein the received data includes product configuration data;
processing the received data with a second computer system to generate a first product configuration;
providing data to the first computer system to allow the first computer system to display the first product configuration;
receiving a request from the first computer system to automatically generate a second product configuration that is comparable to the first product configuration;
processing the request with the second computer system to automatically generate the second product configuration; and
providing data to the first computer system to allow the first computer system to display the first and second product configurations and allow comparison of features of the first and second product configurations. (emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that *Little* neither teaches nor suggests “receiving a request from the first computer system to automatically generate a second product configuration that is comparable to the first product configuration” or “processing the request with the second computer system to automatically generate the second product configuration” as required by claim 29. (emphasis added).

Claim 31 recites:

A computer system comprising:
a processor;
a computer readable medium coupled to said processor; and

computer code encoded in said computer readable medium and executable by said processor to cause said processor to:
receive data from a first computer system, wherein the received data includes product configuration data;
process the received data to generate a first product configuration;
provide data to the first computer system to allow the first computer system to display the first product configuration;
receive a request from the first computer system to automatically generate a second product configuration that is comparable to the first product configuration;
process the request to automatically generate the second product configuration; and
provide data to the first computer system to allow the first computer system to display the first and second product configurations and allow comparison of features of the first and second product configurations. (emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that Little neither teaches nor suggests computer code to “receive a request from the first computer system to automatically generate a second product configuration that is comparable to the first product configuration” and “process the request to automatically generate the second product configuration” as required by claim 31.

Claim 33 recites:

A computer program product comprising code encoded in said computer program product to cause a computer system to:
receive data from a first computer system, wherein the received data includes product configuration data;
process the received data to generate a first product configuration;
provide data to the first computer system to allow the first computer system to display the first product configuration;
receive a request from the first computer system to automatically generate a second product configuration that is comparable to the first product configuration;
process the request to automatically generate the second product configuration; and
provide data to the first computer system to allow the first computer system to display the first and second product configurations and allow comparison of features of the first and second product configurations. (emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that Little neither teaches nor suggests code to “receive a request from the first computer system to automatically generate a second product configuration”

that is comparable to the first product configuration” and “process the request to automatically generate the second product configuration” as required by claim 33. (emphasis added).

Claim 35 recites:

A computer system to compare products wherein at least one of the products is automatically generated, the computer system comprising:
means to receive data from a first computer system, wherein the received data includes product configuration data;
means to process the received data to generate a first product configuration;
means to provide data to the first computer system to allow the first computer system to display the first product configuration;
means to receive a request from the first computer system to automatically generate a second product configuration that is comparable to the first product configuration;
means to process the request to automatically generate the second product configuration; and
means to provide data to the first computer system to allow the first computer system to display the first and second product configurations and allow comparison of features of the first and second product configurations. (emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that Little neither teaches nor suggests a computer system that includes “means to receive a request from the first computer system to automatically generate a second product configuration that is comparable to the first product configuration” and “means to process the request to automatically generate the second product configuration” as required by claim 35. (emphasis added).

Claim 37 recites:

A computer system to allow a user to compare multiple product configurations, the computer system comprising:
a processor;
a computer readable medium coupled to said processor; and
computer code encoded in said computer readable medium and executable by said processor to cause said processor to:
communicate with a web site computer system;
transmit data to the web site computer system, wherein the transmitted data includes product configuration data to allow the web site computer system to generate a first product configuration;

transmit a request to the web site computer system to automatically generate a second product configuration that is comparable to the first product configuration;
receive data from the web site computer system to display the first product configuration and display the second, automatically generated product configuration and allow comparison of features of the first and second product configurations. (emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that Little neither teaches nor suggests code to “transmit a request to the web site computer system to automatically generate a second product configuration that is comparable to the first product configuration” and “receive data from the web site computer system to display the first product configuration and the second, automatically generated product configuration and allow comparison of features of the first and second product configurations” as required by claim 37. (emphasis added).

Applicants also respectfully submit that claims dependent from independent claims 29, 31, 33, 35, and 37 are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claim from which each directly or indirectly depends.

In view of the remarks and amendments herein, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on August 3, 2004.



Attorney for Applicant(s)

8-3-2004

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Kent B. Chambers
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 38,839